

REMARKS

Applicant submits this Amendment in reply to the Office Action mailed December 15, 2006.

As an initial matter, Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's allowance of claims 23-25, and the indication of allowance of the subject matter in claims 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, and 22. Applicant has rewritten each of 9, 12, 15, 18, and 21 into independent form to include the subject matter of the base claims. Accordingly, claims 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, and 22 are now in *prima facie* condition for allowance.

Applicant has also amended claims 8, 11, 14, 17, and 20. The originally-filed specification, drawings, and claims fully support the subject matter of amended claims 8, 11, 14, 17, and 20. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 8-25 are presently pending in this application. Claims 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, and 23 are independent claims.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 8, 11, 14, 17, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,479,516 to Hunter ("Hunter"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Hunter does not disclose the claimed invention. For example, each of amended independent claims 8, 11, 14, 17, and 20 recites a "drug injection device." As set forth in the Office Action, Hunter discloses a toothbrush which is not a drug injection device. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Section 102(b) rejection based on Hunter.

Applicant further submits that claims 10, 13, 16, 19, 22, 24, and 25 depend directly from one of independent claim 9, 12, 15, 18, 21, and 23, and each are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that respective independent claim 9, 12, 15, 18, 21, and 23 is allowable. In addition, at least some of the dependent claims recite unique combinations that are neither taught nor suggested by the cited references, and therefore at least some also are separately patentable.

The Office Action contains characterizations of the claims and the related art with which Applicant does not necessarily agree. Unless expressly noted otherwise, Applicant declines to subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

In discussing the specification and claims in this Amendment, it is to be understood that Applicant is in no way intending to limit the scope of the claims to any exemplary embodiments described in the specification and/or shown in the drawings. Rather, Applicant is entitled to have the claims interpreted broadly, to the maximum extent permitted by statute, regulation, and applicable case law.

If there is any fee due in connection with the filing of this Amendment that are not otherwise accounted for, please charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: June 14, 2007

By: 

Michael W. Kim
Reg. No. 51,880